

F  
274  
M14

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 014 418 613 8 •

Hollinger  
pH 8.5  
Mill Run F03-2193

THE  
POLITICAL RECORD  
OF  
Senator F. A. SAWYER,  
AND  
Congressman C. C. BOWEN,  
OF  
SOUTH CAROLINA.

By *E. H. Mackay*

SENATOR F. A. SAWYER AS A REPUBLICAN.

On my return to the city, after a brief visit to Columbia, I found that Senator F. A. Sawyer had, in a communication published in the *Charleston Courier*, attempted some sort of weak, diluted reply to the remarks which I had uttered on the subject of his Republicanism in my speech of the 28th of July.

In that communication, extended to the length of two columns and a half, I have looked in vain for any substantial defence against the charges preferred by me. He makes no denial of my charge that he came to this city, originally, as a devout admirer of the old slave power of the South, and that he was chosen as a teacher by our Commissioners, from among his Northern competitors, because such was his character. He says nothing of his former or his present affiliations with the Democratic party. He does not disclaim that his chief counsellor at this day is a leading Democrat of this city. And he takes especial care to be silent about my allusions to his "sharp practice" in reference to the bills of the Bank of the State.

Instead of this, which alone would have been relevant to the subject of discussion, he indulges in a strain of personal invective and scurrility, in which, as a "Carolina gentleman," (a term which he applies to me with a sinister motive,) I cannot attempt to compete with him. I presume that a "Massachusetts gentleman" would be as adverse as myself to the use of such weapons, borrowed from the armory of Billingsgate.

His only attempt, except by unsupported assertions, to place himself in the Republican ranks, is by an appeal to the record of how he stood in the rebellion. That certainly has nothing to do with his claim to Republicanism now. But I apprehend that if he had, at the time, belonged to that party, he would have been found, at the very commencement of the rebellion, rather in the army of the Republic fighting for the life of the nation, than remaining among its enemies and picking up a little addition to his income by indulging in the unpatriotic business of running the blockade at the expense of the revenues of the United States, at the same time that he gave "aid and comfort" to the Confederacy. Knowing, as I did, how easily he could have left the city at that time: knowing that he and other Northern men had been invited by the authorities to depart from the Confederacy, unless they were willing to become its citizens, and knowing, too, that he had no ties of property or kindred to bind him to the State, not only I, but some others who saw his stalwart form and soldierly bearing at the Union Club, often thought that he was the right man in the wrong place. If every son of Massachusetts had been inspired with a feeling of loyalty akin to that which actuated the course of Mr. Sawyer, that noble old State would have had no such glorious record as that which history now gives of its part in crushing the rebellion.

I shall make no reply to Mr. Sawyer's defence of Mr. Clark. If Mr. Clark is competent to discharge the duties of a Collector of Customs, he must certainly be able to defend himself. When he does so (if he ever does) it will be time enough for me to pay my compliments to him. I should like to hear him deny, in his own person, the charge that he sought the nomination of the Democratic party for the Mayoralty.

Neither shall I be diverted by the scurrilities of Senator Sawyer into a contest of personal invectives. My quarrel is a political one. I seek to save the Republican party from the results of his political



treachery. In that quarrel, and in that quarrel alone, will I fight until the battle is lost or won.

To but a single sentence of this tirade of abuse will I make any reply.

Mr. Sawyer insinuates that I belong to a "little knot of Southern born men who recently proposed to each other to ignore and put down men not of Southern birth."

I suspect that Mr. Sawyer has here drawn upon his imagination or his invention. I know of no such "knot of Southern-born men," and have heard of no such proposition. As far as I am concerned it is simply absurd. The principle which has governed my entire life—a principle which did much to keep me from the heresy of State sovereignty and the sin of secession—is that in this united land, I recognize "no North, no South, no East, no West." Every man, wherever born within our vast dominion, is a citizen of one great empire, entitled everywhere to equal privileges. My warmest and truest friends at this day, in the Republican party, are men of Northern or Western birth. To me, all honest Republicans are the same, no matter from what State they may come. I do not denounce Mr. Sawyer, because Massachusetts gave him birth, but because the political course he is here pursuing, if pursued at Boston, would meet with the same just retribution that South Carolina will yet award to him.

My main charge against Mr. Sawyer is that he is seeking to establish a Conservative party in South Carolina, on the ruins of the Republican, by a sale to the Democrats if they will purchase him.

The only comprehensible reply to this charge that he makes is contained in the following paragraph of his communication, of which, as an explicit recognition of the truth of my allegation, I give him the benefit of a republication, with his own italics:

"It is quite time for *some* Republicans to take notice that the people of South Carolina will give their voices for *respectable and upright men* who may not be Republicans, *rather than for dishonest and disreputable men whose soundness on the party issues may be never so sure.* The day when partisan soundness would offset and outweigh the want of all other requisites for preferment has happily gone by or is now towards its close. If this be conservatism, let Dr. Mackey and his friends make the most of it."

This is Senator Sawyer's first *open* bid tendered to the Democratic party. It will not, I presume, be accepted, because it is accompa-

nied with some sort of weak qualification, which, although it means nothing, the Democrats will require to be stricken from the bond.

But Mr. Sawyer has been too keen a speculator in blockade stock and in depreciated Bank Bills, to be driven from the market by a first refusal. His next bid will be without the qualification.

Let me say to the gentlemen of the Democratic party that if they should buy the Senator at ever so low a price, they will be making a dear bargain.

A. G. MACKEY.

### SENATOR SAWYER'S POLITICS AND LOYALTY.

*To the Editor of the Courier*:—I request the privilege of your columns to make a response to the communication of Senator F. A. Sawyer, which appeared in your issue of the 4th instant. I propose to review Mr. Sawyer's political record, as one of the Senators from South Carolina, and to meet the personal charges and insinuations that he has made against me and my kinsmen in that communication. My line of defence against some of his aspersions must necessarily be to "discredit the witness," otherwise, I should be driven into attempting the logical impossibility of "proving a negative."

McGeoghan, in his admirable history of Ireland, devotes a chapter to "Snakes in Ireland," which chapter consists only of the single word "None."

The writer who would treat of Senator Sawyer's "Republicanism" would be constrained, from the paucity of the subject, to be almost as brief as was the Celtic chronicler, when expounding the snakes of the Emerald Isle. That "Republicanism" begun immediately before Mr. Sawyer's election to the United States Senate, and ended immediately after that election. To that position he was elected by a majority of *one*, (1) although he received the entire Democratic vote of our Legislature, while his competitor, (Dr.



Mackey,) whom he affects to regard as representing only his own immediate family, received the majority of the votes cast by the professed Republicans in that body. Mr. Sawyer, in his communication, admits that the Democrats thus supported him, and adds: "I did not then, nor do I now, hold myself under one particle of obligation to them." But Mr. Sawyer has pleased to abandon this, for him, only vantage ground, and claims that he represents the Republican party of South Carolina. He even asserts himself to be, in his Republicanism, what Caesar declared he would have his wife to be—"above suspicion," as witness this opening paragraph of his defence:

"Dr Mackey is too well known, and I am too well known in this immediate community, to make it requisite to defend myself from charges of obliquity or tergiversation in political or other affairs."

This is the very sublime of impudence! It is so admirably cool as to need no ice, even in this torrid August day!

If—as Rochefoucauld says—"hypocrisy is the homage that vice pays to virtue," then this asseveration by Sawyer, of his Republican chatisty, must be regarded as one of the highest tributes ever paid to political integrity.

In proof of this opinion, I cite the following facts:

The Legislature that elected Mr. Sawyer to the United States Senate, was composed almost entirely of colored men, all of whom claimed to be, and doubtless were, earnest Republicans. To all of those he gave either an express or an implied assurance, that he was in hearty accord with their political views, yet as a Senator of the United States, he voted in opposition to the Republican majority of the Senate, against a measure designed to secure from probable defeat the proposed Fifteenth (15th) Amendment to the Constitution of the United States; an amendment which will guarantee to the colored man forever the right of suffrage, and which will set the broad seal of the Constitution upon the new patent of American citizenship to be granted to all men, without regard to "race, color, or previous condition of servitude."

On this point I submit the record, as it appears in the "Daily Globe"—the official paper of Congress—of April 10th, 1869, and in the New York Tribune of the same date:

"The House Reconstruction Bill being under discussion, Mr. Morton offered an additional section providing that before Virginia, Mississippi and Texas shall be admitted to representation in Con-

gress, their several Legislatures shall ratify the Fifteenth Amendment to the Constitution."

The Democrats of the Senate voted solid against this proposition, and among them we find, voting "nay," "F. A. Sawyer, of South Carolina."

It is universally admitted, and will not be denied by any journalist in this State, either Democratic or Republican, that without this condition precedent to the admission of the unreconstructed States, the proposed Fifteenth Amendment would fail of adoption. Yet after *this* vote, Mr. Sawyer has the effrontery to say in his reply to Dr. Mackey, "I accept the platform he (Dr. M.) lays down as the principles inscribed on the banners of Republicanism, namely: equal political rights to all men of every race, protection to labor, free speech, free schools and a *free ballot*."

"And what is better than accepting them on a banner or on paper; I have spoken, written, voted and worked for them, without change of purpose or cessation of effort."

Let the reader view this declaration of Sawyer's in the light of Sawyer's vote, above given, and he will agree with me, that hereafter, when a politician in this State requires a strong expletive to characterize some bold denial of a known fact, he will be very apt to call it "a Sawyerism."

But to return to Mr. Sawyer's political treachery, or as he phrases it, "obliquity and tergiversation," two words which may be regarded as "great guns," taken from his arsenal of language. Mr. Sawyer, not content with his endeavor to defeat (virtually) the Fifteenth Amendment proposed and advocated "without cessation of effort," and finally secured the adoption of an amendment to the House Reconstruction Bill, providing for the submission of the Constitutions of Virginia, Texas and Mississippi—striking out the words "the registered voters of said State," and inserting instead the words "Voters of said State registered at the time of said submission."

The adoption of this Sawyer amendment made a Democratic triumph certain in the election then pending in Virginia, and was doubtless so designed by its proposer. The necessary effect of this change will appear when it is remembered that a registration of the voters in Virginia was had last fall, pursuant to Act of Congress, and vast numbers of the Democrats stood upon their dignity, and declined to register. Hence it was the natural desire of the Repub-



leans to proceed to an election on the *old* registration, as this would have insured their success. Mr. Sawyer's amendment, however, authorized a new registration, thereby opening wide the door to a system of fraud and intimidation, and ending last July in the utter defeat of the Republican party in Virginia.

The Washington correspondent of the New York Tribune, writing of the debate on this occasion, under date of April 9, says: "The House Bill providing for elections in Mississippi, Virginia and Texas was immediately taken up, and after two hours had been consumed by the Democrats, repeating their old arguments, it was passed with certain amendments.

"The most important of the amendments were Mr. Morton's proposition, making a pre-requisite of admission to representation in Congress, that these three States ratify the Fifteenth Amendment, and one by Mr. Sawyer, providing that the election on the adoption of the Constitutions shall be held under the *new registration*. This (Sawyer's) is a very important amendment, as in Virginia alone there are not less than fifteen thousand (15,000) whites (Democrats) on the new registration who were not on the old list."

Mr. Sawyer cannot plead that he acted in ignorance of the facts, in proposing his amendment, for the entire Republican press, both in Washington and Virginia, had openly opposed the new registration. Suffice it to say, that Mr. Sawyer, as he gazes upon the broken and defeated Republican party in Virginia, cannot exclaim, as did the horror stricken Macbeth, to the Ghost of Banquo:—"Thou can'st not say I did it! Never shake thy gory locks at me!"

So much for Mr. Sawyer's record as United States Senator. I have shown that on the *only party issue* that has arisen since his advent in the Senate—an issue most vital to the very existence of the Republican party in the Southern States—he voted against that party, which he now so shamelessly affects to represent.

I now propose to show that Mr. Sawyer is not a credible witness, upon the matters of fact alleged by him. He says: "The fault found with him, (Dr M.,) as Collector of Customs, was, that he managed the Federal patronage of his office so ill, that he was willing not only to administer the oath of July 2d, 1862, known as the test oath, to those who were known to him as unable to take that oath, without falsely swearing, but insisted by his acts, certainly, if not by his words, on retaining more or less of such fore-sworn men in office."

This is certainly a novel doctrine, both in law and ethics, that the administrator of an oath should be held responsible for the guilt incurred by the man who takes it.

The Collector was not the conscience-keeper of any officer of the Customs, and did not and could not know that any one had falsely sworn in taking the oath of office before him. If this theory of responsibility on the part of every administrator of an oath falsely taken be correct, the reader will perceive, from the following affidavits, in what an awkward position "bluff old Ben Wade," the President of the Senate, was placed by his having administered the oath of office, known as the iron-clad oath, to Senator Sawyer.

As Messrs. Sawyer and Bowen are now the Damon and Pythias of political life, I append, first, the following copy of an affidavit by C. C. Bowen, taken from the Washington Globe of July 24, 1868, the original of which is now on file in the United States Senate :

"DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, }  
WASHINGTON COUNTY. } s.s.

Personally appeared before me, a Notary Public in and for said District and County, duly authorized by law to administer oaths, C. C. Bowen, a member of Congress from the Second Congressional District of South Carolina, and ———, a citizen of Charleston, in said State, who being duly sworn, depose and say, that they are well and personally acquainted with Frederick A. Sawyer, who claims to have been elected a Senator of the United States, by virtue of an election held in the city of Columbia, by the Legislature of South Carolina, on the 16th day of July, 1868, and your deponents further declare that they have good and sufficient reasons to believe, and do believe, that the said Sawyer is not eligible to hold a seat in the Senate of the United States, *by reason of the fact, which can be fully shown by credible witnesses, whose names are hereto attached, that the said Sawyer was engaged in aiding and abetting the rebellion against the Government of the United States, in the years 1862, 1863 and 1864, by being a shareholder in a blockade company, engaged in running the blockade at the port of Charleston, South Carolina, and in furnishing material of war to the so-called Confederate States, and aid and comfort to the supporters thereof; and in support of this averment deponents present the following list of witnesses,"* to wit:

\* \* \* \* \*

"And deponents further declare that they have good and suffi.

cient reasons to believe, and do believe, that the said Sawyer was a member of a military organization in armed hostility to the Government of the United States, in the city of Charleston, in the year 1864; and that he did military duty as a member of said organization, known as the 'Charleston' Home Guard.'

\* \* \* \* \*

"And deponents further declare, that they are informed and believe that the said Sawyer, despite the facts herein alleged, did take the oath of July 2d, 1862, as Collector of Internal Revenue for the Second Congressional District of South Carolina in the year 1865.

(Signed)

C. C. BOWEN.

\* \* \* \* \*

"Subscribed and sworn to before me, this 20th day of July, 1868.

JOHN F. CALLAN, Notary Public."

Mr. Sawyer will hardly attempt to discredit his "own witness."

This affidavit was laid before the Senate on Mr. Sawyer's presenting his credentials to that body. The Senate, after long debate, decided to admit him to his seat, on the purely technical ground, that the possession of the certificate of election entitled him to his seat in the first instance, and that any procedure to prove him ineligible, must be prosecuted after he became a member of the body. Seventeen Senators, headed by Mr. Sumner, and including Senators Wilson, Howard, Morton, Drake and Sherman, voted and spoke against his admission.

I now append an extract from the deposition of one who is a most "friendly witness" for Mr. Sawyer, having breathed the breath of official life from his nostrils, and lives and moves, and has his (political) being in the "great" Senator:

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA, }  
COUNTY OF CHARLESTON, } s.s.

Personally appeared, J. D. Geddings, of the State and County aforesaid, who being duly sworn, deposes and says, that he was a resident of the city of Charleston during the entire period of the late war, and that he is at present Assistant Treasurer of the United States.

\* \* \* \* \*

Said deponent further says, in reference to a charge alleged to have been made by certain persons, that said Sawyer aided the rebellion by being engaged in blockade running, that this deponent was fully cognizant of the connection of said Sawyer with that

*business, and that the facts are as follows, namely: Some time in 1863, said Sawyer became possessed of a small interest, (less than \$100 in good value,) in a schooner intended to be laden with cotton to run the blockade, and this interest was taken by him on the express condition that said schooner should not return to the States in rebellion, but that vessel and cargo should be sold on arrival at a foreign port, and the net proceeds of sale should be returned to the shareholders in sterling exchange, said Sawyer declaring that he would have no part or lot in introducing supplies of any kind into the States in rebellion.*

This deponent further says, that the said vessel and cargo was sold in Nassau, New Providence, and the net proceeds thereof were returned to the shareholders in sterling exchange as aforesaid. Said deponent further says, that said Sawyer did, in September, 1864, *succeed in a project long before entertained by him, whereby he escaped from the States in rebellion.*

\* \* \* \* \*

(Signed)

J. D. GEDDINGS.

Sworn and subscribed this eighteenth day of July, 1868, before me,

J. W. BROWNFIELD, C. C. P. G. S.

Mr. Geddings' affidavit is sufficiently full for my purpose, yet he is certainly mistaken in the extent of Mr. Sawyer's blockade operations, and his deposition is actually amusing, where it intimates that Mr. Sawyer was only engaged in a sort of a "National Union Patriotic Blockade Company."

He is utterly misinformed when he states that Mr. Sawyer "escaped" from this city, for it is universally known among the citizens of Charleston that he received a written pass to go through our lines, and was sent out to the United States fleet in our harbor, by flag of truce in open day, with many other persons, the Confederate authorities extending every courtesy to him and his family.

In view of this exhibit, the reader will judge whether it was either just or politic in Mr. Sawyer to charge any man with being "*foresworn*."

"*Foresworn*" indeed!

Mr. Sawyer must either vindicate himself against these charges that I now brand upon his forehead, or he must be universally regarded as an interloper in the ranks of honorable men.

T. J. MACKEY.

Charleston, S. C., August 7, 1869.

## A DISSECTION OF THE REPLY OF CONGRESSMAN C. C. BOWEN.

Like Midshipman Easy, I find myself engaged in "a triangular duel," and having, I hope, disposed of one of my antagonists, I am now to direct my fire upon the other. It is true that Mr. C. C. Bowen, not having in his early days paid much attention to those elementary sciences, which a late London Alderman designated as "the three R's., Reading, Riting and Rithmetic," has placed himself behind the body of a friend more skillful of fence, and borrowed the services of an "accomplished letter writer" to do his dirty work. But for the purposes of discussion I am forced to consider and treat Mr. Bowen's letter as if it really were his own production.

Many of the statements made by Mr. Bowen are incapable of proof or disproof. When he refers to language used in private interviews, the very nature of the interview precludes the possibility of his introducing any testimony to prove that the language was used, or of my introducing any to prove that it was not. In cases of this kind the assertion of each disputant must be taken for what it is worth.

It is proper that I should say, in the very beginning of this discussion, that I shall be compelled repeatedly to brand Mr. Bowen with willful falsehood. The reader will have to judge for himself who of the two is to be believed. My record is before the community in which I have lived for more than sixty years. I shall say nothing of it. Mr. Bowen's record is also before the community, and of that it will be necessary that I should say a few words.

That record says that originally C. C. Bowen was a professed gambler of the lowest class, and that while pursuing that not very reputable occupation in this city, he feloniously abstracted from one of his confederates the implements of his trade, and with them fled to New York, where he sold them.

That record further states, that being an officer in the Confederate army, he was cashiered for the commission of fraud, by a court martial, where the charge was clearly proved.

There are other passages in his record, but as these are enough



to place him beyond the pale of all honorable men, and wholly to discredit his evidence, I shall, as to the rest, give him the mercy of silence.

Now I wish it to be distinctly understood that I have not made these charges in any spirit of malignity, and that I deplore the necessity of using such language—language that in numerous discussions I have never before employed in reference to any other opponent. But Mr. Bowen compels me to this course. He has, by his reckless assertions, reduced our contest almost, altogether, to a question of veracity between himself and me. It is therefore my right, nay more, is it my duty to discredit him if I can, by showing that from the baseness of his antecedent life he has rendered himself unworthy to be believed.

I owe it, however, to myself to say that when I supported Mr. Bowen for Congress, I was not cognizant of this baseness of his character. Had I then been aware of it he would not, with my consent, have been elevated to the position which he now so unworthily fills. The Republican party will, I trust, exonerate me from the charge of knowingly foisting such a character upon it.

I now proceed to a dissection of his reply, and in doing so will not spare the subject under my scalpel.

Mr. Bowen says: "In that month (July, 1868) I went with Dr. M., who was in Washington, to the Treasury Department, to see what could be done to clean out the Custom House of the Democratic employees. Dr. Mackey was there informed, in my hearing, that his recommendation would be regarded as *good cause* for removal and appointment."

This statement is a deliberate FALSEHOOD. In July, 1868, I went to the office of the Commissioner of Customs, not "to see what could be done to clean out the Custom House," for at that time that subject had never been broached, but to complain of the conduct of one Dutch, a contemptible spy or detective of the Treasury, who had unwarrantably interfered in the Senatorial election. To give greater force to my complaint, I had invited Messrs. Goss and Bowen, members of Congress, to accompany me. The complaint having been made, we left the building, having seen no other officer. The Commissioner of Customs has nothing to do with appointments, and is a man too well acquainted with the duties of his office to have given any such assurance. And my influence at that time with the Secretary, who alone could have given that assurance,

is best shown by the fact that on the next day my own removal was recommended to the Senate.

Mr. T. J. Mackey, to whose appointment he alludes in this connection, as the result of this supposititious interview with the Secretary, was not appointed at my suggestion, but upon the request of certain Congressional powers at Washington, whose influence in his behalf was exerted upon the Department.

Mr. Bowen says: "I must, however, do Mr. Mackey the justice to say that he expressed a willingness to remove the Deputy Collector, if his son Arthur could be put in his place."

This is another falsehood, but one which assumes that form which logicians call "the suppression of truth." It would not be worth noticing, were it not that its covert intention is to charge me with undue nepotism in the distribution of offices. The truth is simply this: Mr. Bowen proposed the removal of the Deputy Collector. I was opposed to it; first, because that gentleman had left an excellent situation in New York to take the office of Deputy, at my request, and secondly, because I knew that he was a Republican, and had never voted any but the Republican ticket in his life. But Mr. Bowen, pressing his removal on the ground that he was not an active, working Republican, I at length consented, but at the same time expressed my unwillingness to take any untried and inexperienced man in the place; because my responsibilities, and those of my bondsmen, for the conduct of the Deputy Collector, were too great to permit me to assume such a risk. I refused to hazard my property and character, except in the hands of one who I knew to be faithful to my interests, and competent to discharge the duties of the office; and as I knew no one here who could fulfill both of these requisites, except my son, I said that if the present Deputy was to be removed, I must put my son in his place. Every man who is acquainted with the business of the Custom House, and the peculiar relations existing between the Collector and his Deputy, will say that I was justified in the course I pursued. But that I was not anxious to elevate my son to that position, is evident from the fact that the Deputy Collector remained in office until my own removal.

Again, Mr. Bowen says: "The whole Congressional delegation from South Carolina recommended a good staunch Republican for a position in the Custom House. For the sake of courtesy this paper was sent to Dr. Mackey for his approval, before presentation to the President."

Short as this statement is, it contains an untruth. The person recommended was Dr. M. H. Collins; the position for which he was recommended was that of an appraiser. The paper sent to me was a private letter from Mr Bowen, asking me to recommend the nomination. To this was appended a brief request of the same purport signed by Mr. Sawyer.

"The whole Congressional delegation from South Carolina" did *not* sign it. Dr. Collins had other papers of an older date in his possession, signed by several prominent members of the party, recommending him for an entirely different position.

Mr. Bowen says again: "When the paper was presented to the ex-Collector, he threw it down contemptuously, stamped on it in rage, and said 'he was the Collector, and did not propose to be dictated to by anybody.'"

All of this is grossly false. The request contained in Mr. Bowen's letter was that I would give "an immediate approval of his nomination for appraiser." I declined, but in courteous terms, to do so, for two reasons. In the first place, I was better acquainted than Mr. Bowen with the proper qualifications of an Appraiser, and without intending offence to Dr. Collins, I might have believed that he did not possess those qualifications. With that belief I could not, as an honest man, give the required approval. And, secondly, the nomination was ~~not~~ in my gift. I had no more to do with it than I had with that of Collector of Internal Revenue. The office was a Presidential appointment, and I could not, without officious interference, have volunteered an opinion to the President as to whom he should nominate. But I said to Dr. Collins, and I wrote to the same effect to Mr. Bowen, that if he would take the responsibility of nominating Dr. Collins as an Appraiser, I should make no opposition, and if appointed, he should be treated with all the courtesy and kindness that I was accustomed to extend to every officer who did his duty. My approval was not necessary, and if Mr Bowen had been sincere in his professions to Dr. Collins, why did he not, on my assurance of acquiescence, which was all that Dr. Collins asked, make the nomination and secure the appointment. I challenge him to produce my letter to him. His to me is ready for the perusal of any one who is curious to know how some members of Congress, who make promises which they probably do not care to fulfill, can seek to throw the odium of their duplicity on the shoulders of others.

Again, Mr. Bowen says: "On my return to Charleston *I did*

*inform Dr. Mackey why the nominations were stopped, and gave as a reason that the white man nominated had never been known as a Republican, and that the colored men were not working, active Republicans, though they might have voted the Republican ticket."*

"Lord, Lord," quoth Falstaff, "how this world is given to lying." This is one of the most unmitigated falsehoods in the whole of this truthless production. Nothing but the duty I owe to the Republican party to expose a traitor, could have induced me, after I first read the above cited paragraph, to hold a moment's further communication with one so utterly regardless of every principle of honor. My nature loathes such creatures as men turn with disgust from a contact with slimy serpents.

Mr. Bowen "on his return to Charleston" did *not* inform me why the nominations were stopped, but, on the contrary, with signal duplicity, expressed an entire ignorance of the cause, and explicitly declared that he had had nothing to do with it. And I will show by his subsequent course that he could not have assigned the reason that he says he did, unless he combined in his own nature the two characters of knave and fool.

To place this matter in its true light, I shall have to publish a letter of Mr. Bowen to me, accompanied by his recommendation of a list of nominations which he desired me to make. This is the "list" referred to in my speech, and of which he says that "I did not deem it safe to read the names contained in it." Mr. Bowen will now be gratified, and after reading my commentary he will be able to say whether there was danger to him or to me in its publication. I am inclined to believe that if he were familiar with Shakspeare he would be ready to exclaim, "Is not this a lamentable thing, that of the skin of an innocent lamb should be made parchment? That parchment being scribbled o'er, should undo a man? I did but seal once to a thing and I was never mine own man since." But here is the letter and list:

"CHARLESTON, S. C. May 28, 1869.

*Hon. A. G. Mackey, Collector of Customs, Charleston, S. C.:*

DEAR SIR:—I have the honor to submit the subjoined list of persons for your consideration, with the request that you will recommend them to the Secretary of the Treasury for the positions in your department set opposite their names. Trusting the same will be satisfactory to yourself, I remain, very truly, your friend,

C. C. BOWEN."



On the second page of the same letter was the following :

“ *List of Persons recommended for Appointments in the Custom House, Charleston, S. C., by C. C. B.:*

John Tuomey, Appraiser, *vice* B. J. Parker.

W. C. Birney, Abstract Clerk, *vice* P. H. Cantwell.

James Dobbins, Abstract Clerk, *vice* B. G. Shaffer.

L. F. Wall, Storekeeper, *vice* Horlbeck.

Stephen Maxwell, Inspector, *vice* Washington.

Chas. N. Hoyt, Inspector, *vice* Cudworth.

Jared Dennis, Inspector, *vice* J. Y. Savage.

Joseph Quash, Inspector, *vice* Moroso.

F. H. Carmand, Inspector, *vice* Cramer.

Wm. Grant, Night Inspector, *vice* James Erwin.

John B. Mushington, Night Inspector, *vice* Webb.

Hamilton Slawson, Steamboat Inspector, *vice* Hughes.

T. Garety, Steamboat Inspector, *vice* Kirkwood.

Richard Forrest, Watchman, *vice* O'Lara,

Peter Mazyc, Watchman, *vice* McMerherny,

Joseph Greene, Porter, *vice* Hargrave.”

Now for the commentary. The names sent on by me on the 15th April, whose confirmation was stopped by Mr. Bowen, were those of J. P. Hughes, Stephen J. Maxwell, William A. Grant and Joseph Quash. The last three were colored men.

Mr. Bowen says that the colored men nominated by me on the 15th April, “were not *working, active Republicans*,” hence he opposed their confirmation.

Again Mr. Bowen says: “Sometime subsequently to this, a list of men known to be good working Republicans, at least half of whom were colored men, and all believed to be competent for the positions for which they were recommended, was sent by the hands of General Jno. B. Dennis to the Collector, with the request that they should be recommended by him for appointment.”

Will the reader now be kind enough to inspect the list above published, and which Mr. Bowen says was “a list of men known to be good working Republicans.” In that list he will find the names of Messrs. Maxwell, Grant and Quash, recommended by him to me as “good working Republicans,” but whose confirmation he had secretly opposed only ten days before at Washington, because, as he says, they, “the colored men, were not *working, active Republicans*.”



His contradictions show how reckless he is of truth, and should teach him the wisdom of the proverb, that "liars should have good memories." Either he played false in saying that these gentlemen were not good working Republicans, and, therefore, in opposing their confirmation, or he was false in recommending them afterwards to me as good Republicans. Let him take either horn of the dilemma. But mark this man's further duplicity. After recommending to me the names of Messrs. Quash and Grant, and agreeing with me at my house, on the 28th of May, that he would proceed forthwith to Washington and urge their confirmation, he goes the next day to that city and opposes their confirmation, so that Messrs. Grant and Quash were not appointed. The English language affords no words expressive of such conduct with which I would defile the columns of a respectable journal.

Mr. Bowen says in continuation: "This list excited another burst of that indignation of which Dr. Mackey always has a stock on hand"

It is pleasant to hear a half dozen words of truth form the lips of the Congressman, although looking to the length of his communication they are "as two grains of wheat hid in two bushels of chaff." I thank Heaven that the insolence of any man "dressed in a little brief authority," has always excited and will ever excite, I hope, my indignation. Well do they say that "Dr. Mackey cannot be managed." I have no intention, in any position that I may occupy, to play the part of a mere tool. No man, I was resolved, should say that Dr. Mackey was the Collector, but that Senator Sawyer and Congressman Bowen "ran the Custom House." If it suits the temperament of my successor to be placed for the lucre of gain in this contemptible position, I have nothing to say, but that is a matter of taste, and my palate revolts at the morsel.

Speaking of the interview at my house where the nominations to be sent to Washington were agreed upon, Mr. Bowen says: "I heard them through patiently, listened to their proposals, and rising to go, pointed to my own list, and said, 'if you take my advice you will appoint those men.'"

The audacity of this falsehood is such that I am compelled to borrow language in which to reply to it, and to say to Congressman Bowen, in the words of Congreve: "Ferdinand Mendez Pinto was but a type of thee, thou liar of the first magnitude."

But my taste and all the associations of my life make me recoil with contempt and disgust from further discussion with one so regardless of every principle of honor. I see plainly that our Congressman has followed, without knowing it, the advice of Sir Toby Belch to Sir Andrew Aguecheek: "As many lies as will lie in thy sheet of paper, although that sheet were big enough for the bed of Ware, in England, set it down." And I am weary of detecting and denouncing what Touchstone calls "the lie circumstantial and the lie direct." It is sufficient to say that the assertions in the latter part of his communication are just as false as those in the former part. I shall, therefore, abstain from any more detail, and conclude with a brief statement of what were the facts in relation to the appointments of the Custom House.

When Mr. Johnson, by whose Administration I was hampered, went out of power, there were thirty-one employees in the Custom House whose nomination was in my gift. Of these sixteen were Republicans, a majority of whom were members of the League, and fifteen Democrats. By the 15th of April, which was as soon as I had recovered from my illness, contracted on the 4th of March, I had displaced two Democrats and recommended the removal of four more. These four were retained by Mr. Bowen's exertions against my Republican nominations. On the 28th of May, having agreed with him upon a list, I nominated ten Republicans to take the place of ten Democrats. Seven of these only were confirmed, Mr. Bowen still working against my Republican nominations and keeping Democrats, whose removal I had recommended, in place. One of those three resigned upon my request to him. So that on the 26th of June, when I was removed from office, because, as Mr. Bowen says, I would do nothing for the Republicans, the role of the Custom House stood as follows: Whole number of employees, *thirty* (30)—Republicans, twenty-five; Democrats, five. Notwithstanding the opposition of Mr. Bowen, I had succeeded in reducing the Democratic list from fifteen to five, and in increasing the Republican from sixteen to twenty-five. If Mr. Bowen had aided me, as he had pledged himself to do, the twenty-five Republicans would have been increased to twenty-eight, and the Democrats reduced to three. The place of the resigned Democrat, which continued vacant, would have been filled by a Republican.

With this statement, I leave the Republican party to judge who has served that party, and who has worked to betray it.

A. G. MACKEY.

## A LEAF FROM THE RECORD OF CRIME.

---

### ARRAIGNMENT OF C. C. BOWEN.

---

#### TO THE PUBLIC.

In his recent defence of himself from the charge of "political treachery," C. C. Bowen was pleased to make me the subject of personal reflections and insinuations, designed to injure my reputation abroad, although they will doubtless have the effect, as emanating from him, to commend me to all honorable men who know his personal history. I propose to reply briefly to those reflections, and show from the record that C. C. Bowen is not a credible witness upon a question of fact. I regret that I am obliged to make this reply during his absence from the city; but the vices, like virtues, flourish together, and C. C. Bowen has added cowardice to slander by flying from Charleston as soon as he had placed the manuscript of his scurrilous article in the hands of the printer.

Referring to Dr. Mackey's removals and appointments in the Custom House, Bowen states, in his communication, "He (Dr. M.) came home and recommended the removal of ex-Confederate Surgeon Dupont, and the appointment of ex-Confederate Captain T. J. Mackey, the man who was once indicted for violating the neutrality laws in the days of gray-eyed Walker, of Nicaraguan fame; subsequently is said to have made unusually profitable use of a petition for pardon of a mail robber; was well known in Texas, (a State in which they are doubtless worse men than he;) was afterwards some kind of a ranger in the Confederate army, then something else in Texas, then a clerk in the Freedman's Bureau in Washington; for a brief period titular private secretary to Governor Scott, and chief fugleman and destroyer of his brother's

chances for senatorial honors, from which laborious but unprofitable station he was promoted to foreign entry clerk in the Charleston Custom House."

It will be seen that Mr. Bowen charges that I am an "ex-Confederate captain," a charge which, made in connection with his allegation that persons "disqualified" by law were retained in the Custom House by Dr. Mackey, could have been meant only to convey the impression that I am embraced in this class. Yet Bowen knows that my name is included in the very act of Congress by which he himself was relieved of his political disabilities, passed June 26, 1868. I admit that I am an ex Confederate. I was a captain of engineers in the Confederate army, which I entered as a citizen of South Carolina, in obedience to the accepted political code of my people. In that capacity I served actively for near four years as the chief engineer of important military districts; served in many battles on the staff of General Sterling Price—a hero worthy to have worn the white plume of Navarre; and I followed the varying fortunes of that noble chief to their sad but honorable close. I then surrendered my sword, he preferring to die in exile rather than stoop his lofty crest to the conqueror, even though that conqueror represented, as he did, the flag of his country that gave protection alike to the victor and the vanquished.

In the course of that service, I performed no act unworthy of a good soldier, or a man of honor.

But how stands it with C. C. Bowen, whose name, by a civic fiction, now bears the prefix "Honorable?"

He is a New England man, born and reared in Rhode Island, near the very altar of liberty. He entered the Confederate army as a lieutenant of cavalry, and after an ignominious career of two years, he was cashiered (as I can show by the official record before me) for the *crime of forgery!*

It is also true that I was indicted with General Walker on the charge of violating the neutrality laws of the United States, but I have yet to learn that this fact could detract from my standing as a gentleman. Immediately after my trial and acquittal on that charge, I was appointed by the authorities at Washington as Examiner of United States surveys for Kansas and Nebraska.

I was not a clerk, but the Examiner of Accounts, in the Freedmen's Bureau, and in that capacity I became acquainted with the evidence on which C. C. Bowen was arrested and committed to



prison by General Sickles, on the charge of STEALING MONEY from the freedmen. It is true that I was private secretary to Governor Scott, the same gallant soldier and worthy gentleman whose duty it became, as assistant commissioner of the Freedmen's Bureau for South Carolina, to have Bowen arrested (for STEALING) and to make him, through the military authorities, disgorge a large amount of his ill-gotten gains.

It is true that I am "well known in Texas." In the summer of 1865, as acting United States provost marshal over twenty counties of that State, I arrested many criminals, some of whom were executed for the crime of murder, after a fair and impartial trial, on far less evidence than that adduced to prove that C. C. Bowen murdered Colonel White, by the hands of a hired assassin, in his bedroom at Georgetown, S. C., in November, 1864, for which bloody deed he escaped punishment, through the flight of his accomplice, after a full confession. He was confined in prison here on that charge, and was released at the general jail delivery made by the United States forces on their entry into Charleston, in 1865.

This dark but truthful story of Bowen's crimes, is not inconsistent with his ante-war record.

He came to this city in 1859 as the head of a band of the lowest class of gamblers, and soon signalized his advent by stealing a valuable set of faro checks from an establishment in this city, which checks he sold in New York, where they were recovered by their owner, together with the written proof of Bowen's guilt. This fact I can prove by a "cloud of witnesses." The municipal authorities of this city have been frequently appealed to during the past month by his wife at Louisville, whom he has abandoned, although a worthy woman, to aid her in securing a support from him, while he is living in open infamy with another in this city.

Bowen charges that I "preside over so-called Union Leagues, where, for a fee of fifty dollars, he puts through resolutions to slander good Republicans."

It is true that I am president of the Union League of Charleston, the same League that subscribed money, earned by the hard hands of the laboring men who chiefly composed it, to feed Bowen's putative children in this city in 1867, while he was imprisoned in Castle Pinckney on the charge of *stealing*—a charge which the members of the League were led to believe untrue from his plausible representations and earnest protestations of innocence. The



resolutions to which Bowen refers were passed to denounce the proposed appointment of his friend, G. W. Clark, as collector of this port, and to stigmatize the political treachery of Senator F. A. Sawyer and C. C. Bowen. Surely it did not require "a fee of fifty dollars" to induce me to support such resolutions.

It is worthy of note, that United States Senator Sawyer, who is now Bowen's bosom friend and co-conspirator, was charged by Bowen, on oath, in July, 1868, with having committed the crime of perjury in taking the iron-clad oath—a charge which is true.

I have thus briefly glanced at the criminal history of this "Honorable Representative from South Carolina." It is to be hoped that justice will yet overtake him,

"And put in every honest hand a whip,  
To lash the rascal naked through the world."

T. J. MACKEY.

*Charleston, August 10, 1869.*

### CONGRESSMAN C. C. BOWEN IN A NEW ROLE.

The following extract of a letter, received in Charleston was published in the *Charleston News*, of August 20, 1869. It forms an appropriate appendix to the preceding memoir of this "Honorable" Congressman.

"At the time of the evacuation of the little Town of Jacksonville, Florida, by the Confederate forces and its citizens, in the latter part of 1861 or the early part of 1862, *I was there*, having been sent from Virginia (by a special application made by Governor Milton to President Davis) to drill some of the Florida State troops. I was the officer who conveyed the order from General Trapier (then commanding that department) to Major Charles Hopkins, (commanding Hopkins' Battalion) to proceed at once to Jacksonville, for his battalion was then at Baldwin, and burn the saw mills in and around the place, together with the foundry and any other buildings that might prove serviceable to the enemy, but

'to spare and protect as far as possible all private dwellings and property, except such as was specially specified in the order.' The enemy's gunboats had, I believed at the time of the burning, the very night crossed the St. John's bar, and were cautiously feeling their way up the river. The saw mills and foundry, as was ordered, were soon consigned to the flames, as was also the large hotel, (the Judson House,) and several stores—the stores and hotel, however, *not by hands of Hopkins' Battalion*. Mr. Bowen was one of the perpetrators of this outrage, and I will here state, on the word and honor of a man, 'that, on the night of the fire in Jacksonville, *I saw him* one of the prime movers and instigators in the *gutting* of C. L. Robinson's store. I there saw him move and assist in moving blankets and sheets filled with goods and merchandise *stolen* from said store, and knowing, too, that Mr. Robinson was a 'good Union man,' so-called; and mark me, at this time this '*Honorable*' gentleman, C. C. Bowen, *did not belong*, nor was he in *any wise connected* with any organized Confederate force, but came to Jacksonville, upon this occasion, *solely* for the purpose of pillage and plunder, and the goods he stole, *for he did steal them*, he appropriated to himself.

"He was at that time known in Jacksonville and around the eastern part of Florida as a low, mean, contemptible, one-horse gambler,' one who would lie or steal whenever it suited him to do so. He was at or about that time, I think, associated with a man by the name of Woodward, also a gambler, but by far a more decent man than Bowen. Woodward, since the war, has been imprisoned on charges made against him by C. L. Robinson for acts said to have been committed on that same night. Woodward was not the man who should have been confined. Mr. Bowen is the gentleman. I have given you this little item of his history, so that he may know that the world knows him. I am perfectly willing at any time to substantiate what I have written, by any number of witnesses."

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 014 418 613 8